

Creation Versus Evolution

[Post Reply](#) [Post Reply](#) [Page](#)

2

<1234 5>

[Author](#) [Message](#) [Topic Rating](#) [Rate Topic](#) [Topic Search](#) [Topic Search](#) [Topic Options](#)
[Topic Options](#)

[deist View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 11 June 2001

Status: Offline

Points: 3568 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote deist](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 09 July 2007 at 5:20am

Actually the question about evolution versus creationism is a wrong one from the very start. Creationism doesn't even qualify as a science.

Evolution is the best scientific theory that exists at the moment.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sponsored Links](#)

[Back to Top](#)

[minuteman View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 25 March 2007

Status: Offline

Points: 1642 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote minuteman Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 10 July 2007 at 5:03pm

Evolution is correct except that there is no natural selection. It is all by the will of Allah that He has created. So evolution is here by creation or vice versa.

We don't believe that Adam was the first man here on earth. He was however the first prophet of Allah. The christians believe that mankind is here only since 6000 years. Islam does not support it.

[Back to Top](#)

[Israfil View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 26 July 2007 at 5:52pm

I didn't realize that so many of you really don't know what evolution is, and let alone, can differentiate between evolution and the process of natural selection. Creationism is a poor excuse of a philosophy and should not be taught in class. God creating the world is a spiritual belief that should be private and in the private homes of people. You cannot physically measure God nor can you prove that God created the planet. However with genetics you can prove that certain creature groups have some genetic link to each other, for instance chimps and humans share 95% of their DNA.

Som religionist just don't like the fact that all of life was once one. I remember discussing with a fellow Muslim the other day about evolution and he didn't like the fact that maybe our closes relative was a chimp. For some reason he considered animals to be less than human. Little does he know that intelligence is not measured on one scale but on several scales but I took his contempt as more of a human pride thing than anything. But yes, to say the world is 6000 years old is simply a delusion made up by Christians (oh wait, its in the Bible). It's funny when Paleontologist study carbon dated bonoes of prehistoric creatures and find that they are millions of years old how can a christian who believes in Creationism answer that? Oh, with, "the devil put those bones there?" LOL

I love my Creator and I take it serious when our Creator is thrown into a theological/scientific circus by idiots who (and I'll quote brother Rami in this) are not equipped with the knowledge of the field. I'll agree with Rami in that biological scientist and genetic researchers have no right commenting on God. This is like the blasphemy of science. Science can neither prove nor disprove anything that is incoporeal or cannot be physically studied. The same thing with theologians. Theologians or religionist alike cannot comment on evolution if they are coming from a doctrinal perspective.

Edited by Israfil

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) Posted: 26 July 2007 at 7:02pm

Originally posted by Israfil Israfil wrote:

I didn't realize that so many of you really don't know what evolution is, and let alone, can differentiate between evolution and the process of natural selection. Creationism is a poor excuse of a philosophy and should not be taught in class. God creating the world is a spiritual belief that should be private and in the private homes of people. You cannot physically measure God nor can you prove that God created the planet. However with genetics you can prove that certain creature groups have some genetic link to each other, for instance chimps and humans share 95% of their DNA.

Som religionist just don't like the fact that all of life was once one. I remember discussing with a fellow Muslim the other day about evolution and he didn't like the fact that maybe our closes relative was a chimp. For some reason he considered animals to be less than human. Little does he know that intelligence is not measured on one scale but on several scales but I took his contempt as more of a human pride thing than anything. But yes, to say the world is 6000 years old is simply a delusion made up by Christians (oh wait, its in the Bible). It's funny when Paleontologist study carbon dated bonoes of prehistoric creatures and find that they are millions of years old how can a christian who believes in Creationism answer that? Oh, with, "the devil put those bones there?" LOL

I love my Creator and I take it serious when our Creator is thrown into a theological/scientific circus by idiots who (and I'll quote brother Rami in this) are not equipped with the knowledge of the field. I'll agree with Rami in that biological scientist and genetic researchers have no right commenting on God. This is like the blasphemy of science. Science can neither prove nor disprove anything that is incoporeal or cannot be physically studied. The same thing with theologians. Theologians or religionist alike cannot comment on evolution if they are coming from a doctrinal perspective.

Wow! So whose the idiot here?!

Anyway, even though I dont believe in evolution, I dont consider it a serious danger to my beliefs, I simply dont believe it because it has not been proven (that's why even most scientists who believe it call it a THEORY). If the existance of a creator should not be taught because it is "not proven", then surely evolution should not be taught either as it is only a theory.

But really when you have to choose from teaching: "we all came from empty space

and an explosion that came out of nowhere for no reason" and Creation, then any sane person must admit that creation makes much more sense. By creation I don't mean that "God was playing with clay and made man", what I mean is that if there was an explosion in empty space which brought about all planets, all plants, all the insects and animals and sciences and arts and emotions and senses etc.etc.etc. then you better believe that there was intelligent design, or else, you simply lack intelligence...or sanity.

Evolution or not, it's clear that there must have been a creator, or else how could the "mutations" have had so many positive rather than negative effect (even though mutations are naturally a bad thing, yet the more evolved or "mutated", the more advanced we are as according to evolution humans have evolved more than all other beings and we are certainly more advanced than all animals and plants-why have there not been any negative mutations).

I don't know whether or not the Bible is correct to say the earth was created 6 or 7 thousand years ago, there are arguments on both sides (watch the first video I posted). But no matter how old the earth is, after reading Evolution Deceit by Harun Yahya and listening to anti-evolution scientists, I see no reason why I should believe in evolution.

The belief in evolution today is similar to the belief that the earth is flat and ends at its edges which existed in Europe a few centuries ago. It was a popular belief, but it was no more than a theory which was later proven wrong.

[Back to Top](#)

[Israfil View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) [Quote Israfil](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 27 July 2007 at 12:47am

Little do you know that science, even theoretical science is our best guess at proof

than religion. Religion cannot prove how the bottle becomes afloat in the water only scientific observation this is why secular science becomes more of a plausible approach to practical truth than religion. A theologian cannot prove how the bottle stays afloat in the water except by stating God willed the bottle to stay afloat. One can be physically measured and one cannot. Just basically observable elements for the position of evolutionist are: fossils, bones, teeth, and other structures not to mention genetic link. So what do you teach children in schools? Observable facts or facts based on faith?

Allah is the Lord of the universe definitely but in the Qur'an Allah asks us to observe nature to find proof of his existence. The difference between this and Creationism is that Creationism, ultimately, stems from doctrinal teachings not empirical study.

Edited by Israfil

[Back to Top](#)

[rami View Drop Down](#)

Moderator Group

Moderator Group

Avatar

Male

Joined: 01 March 2000

Status: Offline

Points: 2549 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote rami](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#) [ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 27 July 2007 at 3:02am

Bi ismillahir rahmanir raheem

assalamu alaikum

Israfil

Do you agree Evolution is a scientific process?

Do you agree Science can only prove what it can observe?

Do you agree that for an animal to change from one form to another its DNA must change?

Can you show me where scientists have explicitly observed this process of DNA changing or rather new genetic information being added to DNA in order for the creature to grow in a specified manner according to its DNA like the laws of genetics state all creatures do, and not simply arrived at the phenomenon of evolution by conclusion.

Creationism is a poor excuse of a philosophy and should not be taught in class.

This is akin to saying philosophy should not be taught, rather you mean philosophy should not be taught as a science.

God creating the world is a spiritual belief that should be private and in the private homes of people.

La illaha illa Allah is not a private belief and should be spread.

You cannot physically measure God nor can you prove that God created the planet. However with genetics you can prove that certain creature groups have some genetic link to each other, for instance chimps and humans share 95% of their DNA.

This is a conclusion based on probability not scientific or observable facts that the two came from each other.

Som religionist just don't like the fact that all of life was once one.

a conclusion not an observable or provable fact.

I remember discussing with a fellow Muslim the other day about evolution and he didn't like the fact that maybe our closest relative was a chimp.

Science states our DNA is similar it can not ever prove by observation why, Islam offers the explanation that Allah turned some humans into apes, When Allah says to a thing Be it is so what observable science is there before he gives his command none. So the why of it is thus not in the hands of scientists it is simply an explanation they offer along with their scientific observations.

You may like to read the following,

Islam and Evolution

<http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/nuh/evolve.htm>

But yes, to say the world is 6000 years old is simply a delusion made up by Christians (oh wait, its in the Bible). It's funny when Paleontologists study carbon dated bones of prehistoric creatures and find that they are millions of years old how can a Christian who believes in Creationism answer that? Oh, with, "the devil put those bones there?" LOL

World changing events which alter the rate of carbon decay?

not that I'm saying the world is 6000 years old.

This is like the blasphemy of science. Science can neither prove nor disprove anything that is incorporeal or cannot be physically studied.

They continually disregard what they can not see with their eyes, this is the state of kufr and what all people in the past asked their prophets "show us a miracle so we can believe".

The same thing with theologians. Theologians or religionists alike cannot comment on evolution if they are coming from a doctrinal perspective.

Many Islamic theologians were qualified scientists at the same time but by today's standards people only specialize in one field.

It wasn't that long ago that architects were also civil engineers only recently have the two disciplines been separate.

Religion cannot prove how the bottle becomes afloat in the water only scientific observation this is why secular science becomes more of a plausible approach to practical truth than religion.

Who said it is the place of religion to clarify why bottles float, Islam's so-called golden age was primarily in scientific endeavor a golden age stemmed from religious practice, the two are not in competition with each other. the place of science is for practical purposes only a lowly place in the grander scheme of things, its value to humans today only comes due to the increasing materialism of societies.

A theologian cannot prove how the bottle stays afloat in the water except by stating God willed the bottle to stay afloat.

What fool would ask a physicist about chemistry and expect a correct answer?

So what do you teach children in schools? Observable facts or facts based on faith?

Observable facts without the fairytale conclusions that come along with them.

Allah is the Lord of the universe definitely but in the Qur'an Allah asks us to observe nature to find proof of his existence.

He is asking us to use all our faculties not simply one or two i.e. see and touch, use all of them to come up with a holistic picture not a half truth.

Rasul Allah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) said: "Whoever knows himself, knows his Lord" and whoever knows his Lord has been given His gnosis and nearness.

[Back to Top](#)

Duende View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 27 July 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 651 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Duende Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 27 July 2007 at 1:31pm

I was reminded by Brother Rami of this excellent review of Richard Dawkins much hyped book "The God Dellusion" and think it's worth sharing:

Lunging, Flailing, Mispunching (From the London Review of Books)

Terry Eagleton

The God Delusion by Richard Dawkins ♦ Bantam, 406 pp, ♦20.00

Imagine someone holding forth on biology whose only knowledge of the subject is the Book of British Birds, and you have a rough idea of what it feels like to read Richard Dawkins on theology. Card-carrying rationalists like Dawkins, who is the nearest thing to a professional atheist we have had since Bertrand Russell, are in one sense the least well-equipped to understand what they castigate, since they don♦ believe there is anything there to be understood, or at least anything worth understanding. This is why they invariably come up with vulgar caricatures of religious faith that would make a first-year theology student wince. The more they detest

religion, the more ill-informed their criticisms of it tend to be. If they were asked to pass judgment on phenomenology or the geopolitics of South Asia, they would no doubt bone up on the question as assiduously as they could. When it comes to theology, however, any shoddy old travesty will pass muster. These days, theology is the queen of the sciences in a rather less august sense of the word than in its medieval heyday.

Back to Top

Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post Posted: 27 July 2007 at 6:02pm

The Dawkins Delusion

<http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=QERyh9YYEis>

Very funny video, a must see for anyone who knows about Charles Dawkins.